The Optimal Mechanism in (ϵ, δ)-Differential Privacy [1]

Quan Geng, and Pramod Viswanath
Coordinated Science Laboratory and Dept. of ECE
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL 61801
Email: {geng5, pramodv}@illinois.edu

arXiv:1305.1330v1 [cs.DS] 6 May 2013

Abstract

We study the optimal mechanisms in (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy for single integer-valued query function under a utility-maximization/cost-minimization framework. We show that the (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy is a framework not much more general than the $(\epsilon, 0)$-differential privacy and $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy in the context of ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions, i.e., minimum expected noise magnitude and noise power. In the same context of ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions, we show the near-optimality of uniform noise mechanism and discrete Laplacian mechanism in the high privacy regime (as $(\epsilon, \delta) \to (0, 0)$).

I. INTRODUCTION

Differential privacy is a framework to quantify to what extent individual privacy in a statistical database is preserved while releasing useful statistical information about the database [1]. The basic idea of differential privacy is that the presence of any individual data in the database should not affect the final released statistical information significantly, and thus it can give strong privacy guarantees against an adversary with arbitrary auxiliary information. For more background and motivation of differential privacy, we refer the readers to the survey [2].

The standard approach to preserve differential privacy for real-valued query function is to perturb the query output by adding random noise with Laplacian distribution. Recently, [3] shows that under a general utility-maximization framework, for single real-valued query function, the optimal ϵ-differentially private mechanism is the staircase mechanism, which adds noise with staircase distribution to the query output.

In this work, we study the (nearly) optimal mechanisms in (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy for single integer-valued query function under a utility-maximization/cost-minimization framework. (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy is a relaxed notion of privacy, compared to the standard ϵ-differential privacy introduced in [1]. (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy includes as special cases:

- $(\epsilon, 0)$-differential privacy; in this standard setting, the optimal mechanism for a general cost minimization framework is the *staircase* mechanism as shown in [3]. In the high privacy regime, the standard discrete Laplacian mechanism too performs well.
- $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy; this setting requires that the total variation of the conditional probability distributions of the query output for neighboring datasets should be bounded by δ. In this paper we show that the uniform noise distribution is near-optimal in the $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy setting for a general class of cost functions.

While the (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy setting is more general than the two special cases – $(\epsilon, 0)$ and $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy – our main result in this work is to show that it is only more general by *very little*; this is done in the context of ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions. We show the near-optimality of uniform noise and discrete Laplacian mechanisms in the high privacy regime (as $(\epsilon, \delta) \to (0, 0)$) for ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions.

The near-optimality of the two mechanisms (designed for the special cases of $(\epsilon, 0)$ and $(0, \delta)$ differential privacy settings) is proved by demonstrating a uniform bound on the ratio between the costs of these two mechanisms and that of the optimal cost in the (ϵ, δ) differential privacy setting in the high privacy regime, i.e., as $(\epsilon, \delta) \to (0, 0)$ for ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions.

A. *Related Work*

Dwork et. al. [1] introduce ϵ-differential privacy and show that the Laplacian mechanism, which perturbs the query output by adding random noise with Laplace distribution proportional to the global sensitivity of the query function, can preserve ϵ-differential privacy. Nissim, Raskhodnikova and Smith [4] show that for certain nonlinear query functions, one can improve the accuracy by adding data-dependent noise calibrated to the smooth sensitivity of the query function, which is based on the local sensitivity of the query function. McSherry and Talwar [5] introduce the *exponential mechanism* to preserve ϵ-differential privacy for general query functions in an abstract setting, where the query function may not be real-valued. Dwork et. al. [6] introduce (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy and show that adding random noise with Gaussian distribution can preserve (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy for real-valued query function.

Ghosh, Roughgarden, and Sundararajan [7] show that for a single count query with sensitivity $\Delta = 1$, for a general class of utility functions, to minimize the expected cost under a Bayesian framework the optimal mechanism to preserve ϵ-differential privacy is the geometric mechanism, which adds noise with geometric distribution. Brenner and Nissim [8] show that for general query functions no universally optimal mechanisms exist. Gupte and Sundararajan [9] derive the optimal noise probability distributions for a single count query with sensitivity $\Delta = 1$ for minimax (risk-averse) users. [9] shows that although there is no universally optimal solution to the minimax optimization problem in [9] for a general class of cost functions, each solution (corresponding to different cost functions) can be derived from the same geometric mechanism by randomly remapping.

Hardt and Talwar [10] study the tradeoff between privacy and error for answering a set of linear queries over a histogram in a differentially private way. The error is defined as the worst expectation of the ℓ^2-norm of the noise. [10] derives a lower bound for the error in low privacy regime by using tools from convex geometry and Markov's inequality, and gives an upper bound by analyzing a differentially private mechanism, K-norm mechanism, which is an instantiation of the exponential mechanism and involves randomly sampling from a high dimensional convex body. Recently, Nikolov, Talwar and Zhang [11] extend the result on the tradeoff between privacy and error to the case of (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy.

B. *Organization*

This paper is organized as follows. We formulate the utility-maximization/cost-minimization under the (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy constraint as a linear programming problem in Section II. In Section III, we study $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy, and show the nearly optimality of the simple uniform noise mechanism. In Section IV, we study the optimal mechanisms in (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy, and show the optimality of uniform noise mechanism and Laplacian mechanism in the regime $(\epsilon, \delta) \to (0, 0)$.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider an integer-valued query function

$$q : \mathcal{D} \to \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is the domain of the databases.

The sensitivity of the query function q is defined as

$$\Delta \triangleq \max_{D_1, D_2 \subseteq \mathcal{D} : |D_1 - D_2| \le 1} |q(D_1) - q(D_2)|, \tag{2}$$

where the maximum is taken over all possible pairs of neighboring database entries D_1 and D_2 which differ in at most one element, i.e., one is a proper subset of the other and the larger database contains just one additional element [2]. Clearly, Δ is an integer in this discrete setting.

Definition 1 ((ϵ, δ)-differential privacy [6]). *A randomized mechanism $\mathcal{K}$ gives ϵ-differential privacy if for all data sets D_1 and D_2 differing on at most one element, and all $S \subset$ Range$(\mathcal{K})$,*

$$Pr[\mathcal{K}(D_1) \in S] \le \exp(\epsilon)\, Pr[\mathcal{K}(D_2) \in S] + \delta. \tag{3}$$

The standard approach to preserving the differential privacy is to add noise to the output of query function. Let $q(D)$ be the value of the query function evaluated at $D \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, the noise-adding mechanism $\mathcal{K}$ will output

$$\mathcal{K}(D) = q(D) + X, \tag{4}$$

where X is the noise added by the mechanism to the output of query function. To make the output of the mechanism be valid, i.e., $q(D) + X \in \mathbb{Z}$, X can only take integer values.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the probability mass function of the noise X, and use $\mathcal{P}_i$ to denote Pr$[X = i]$. For a set $S \subset \mathbb{Z}$, denote Pr$[X \in S]$ by $\mathcal{P}_S$.

In the following we derive the differential privacy constraint on the probability distribution of X from (3).

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Pr}[\mathcal{K}(D_1) \in S] && \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \text{Pr}[\mathcal{K}(D_2) \in S] + \delta && (5)\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\text{Pr}[q(D_1) + X \in S] && \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \text{Pr}[q(D_2) + X \in S] + +\delta && (6)\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\mathcal{P}_{S-q(D_1)} && \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \mathcal{P}_{S-q(D_2)} + \delta && (7)\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\mathcal{P}_{S'} && \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \mathcal{P}_{S'+q(D_1)-q(D_2)} + \delta, && (8) \end{aligned}$$

where $S' \triangleq S - q(D_1) = \{s - q(D_1) | s \in S\}$.

Since (3) holds for any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, and $|q(D_1) - q(D_2)| \le \Delta$, from (8) we have

$$\mathcal{P}_S \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \mathcal{P}_{S+d} + \delta, \tag{9}$$

for any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and for all $|d| \le \Delta$.

Consider a cost function $\mathcal{L}(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is a function of the added noise X. Our goal is to minimize the expectation of the cost subject to the (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy constraint (9):

$$V^* := \min_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{i=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{L}(i)\mathcal{P}(i) \tag{10}$$

$$\text{subject to } \mathcal{P}_S \le \exp(\epsilon)\ \mathcal{P}_{S+d} + \delta, \forall S \subset \mathbb{Z}, d \in \mathbb{Z}, |d| \le |\Delta|.$$

In this work, we restrict our attention to the scenario when the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k)$ is symmetric (around $k = 0$) and monotonically increasing for $k \ge 0$. Furthermore, without loss of generality, we assume $\mathcal{L}(0) = 0$. Using the same argument in Lemma 28 in [3], we only need to consider symmetric noise probability distributions.

III. $(0, \delta)$-DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY

We first consider the simple case when $\epsilon = 0$, i.e., $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy. The $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy constraint requires that the total variation of the conditional probability distributions of the query output for neighboring datasets should be bounded by δ.

In the differential privacy constraint (9), by choosing the subset $S = S_k := \{\ell : \ell \ge k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d = \Delta$, we see that the noise probability distribution $\mathcal{P}$ must satisfy the constraints

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_{k+\ell} \le \delta, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{11}$$

A. $\Delta = 1$

In the special case $\Delta = 1$, the constraints in (11) are particularly simple:

$$p_k \le \delta; \quad \forall k \ge 0. \tag{12}$$

For symmetric cost functions $\mathcal{L}(k)$ that are monotonically increasing in $k \ge 0$, we can now readily argue that the *uniform* probability distribution is optimal.

To avoid integer rounding issues, assume $\frac{1}{2\delta}$ is an integer.

Theorem 1. *If* $\Delta = 1$, *then*

$$V^* = \sum_{k=-\frac{1}{2\delta}}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \delta \mathcal{L}(k), \tag{13}$$

and the optimal noise probability distribution is

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \begin{cases} \delta & -\frac{1}{2\delta} \leq k \leq \frac{1}{2\delta} - 1 \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

B. General Lower Bound for $\Delta \geq 2$

We now turn to understanding (near) optimal $(0, \delta)$ privacy mechanisms in terms of minimizing the expected loss when the sensitivity $\Delta \geq 2$.

Recall that in $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy, the minimum cost V^* is the result of the following optimization problem, which is a linear program:

$$V^* := \min \quad \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{L}(k)\mathcal{P}_k \tag{15}$$

$$\text{such that} \quad p_k \geq 0 \quad \forall k \in N \tag{16}$$

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{P}_k = 1 \tag{17}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_S \leq \ \mathcal{P}_{S+d} + \delta, \forall S \subset \mathbb{Z}, d \in \mathbb{Z}, |d| \leq |\Delta|. \tag{18}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is a symmetric function, we can assume $\mathcal{P}$ is a symmetric probability distribution. In addition, we relax the constraint (18) by choosing $d = \Delta$ and $S = S_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we get a relaxed linear program, the solution of which is a lower bound for V^*. More precisely,

$$V_{LB} := \min \quad 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}(k)\mathcal{P}_k \tag{19}$$

$$\text{such that} \quad \mathcal{P}_k \geq 0 \quad \forall k \in N \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_k \geq \frac{1}{2} \tag{21}$$

$$-\sum_{\ell=0}^{\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_{k+\ell} \geq -\delta, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{22}$$

To avoid integer rounding issues, assume $\frac{1}{2\delta}$ is a positive integer.

Theorem 2. *If*

$$\mathcal{L}(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2\delta}) \geq 2\left(\mathcal{L}(1) + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}} (\mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(i\Delta))\right), \tag{23}$$

then

$$V^* \geq V_{LB} = 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta). \tag{24}$$

Proof: Consider a feasible solution to the optimization problem (19) with primal variables

$$p_k = \begin{cases} \delta & k = 1 + i\Delta, \text{for} \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{1}{2\delta} - 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

The corresponding value of the objective function is

$$2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta). \tag{26}$$

Therefore,

$$V_{LB} \leq 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta). \tag{27}$$

We claim that the above primal variables are the optimal solution. We prove this claim by constructing the corresponding dual variables.

Associating dual variables μ with the constraint in (21), y_k with the constraint in (22), we have the dual linear program:

$$V_{LB} = \max \quad \mu - 2\delta \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} y_k \tag{28}$$

$$\text{such that} \quad \mu \geq 0, y_k \geq 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{29}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu - y_0 \leq 0, \tag{30}$$

$$\mu - \sum_{i=\max(0,k-\Delta+1)}^{k} y_k \leq \mathcal{L}(k), \forall k \geq 1. \tag{31}$$

The complementary slackness conditions require that

$$\mu - y_0 - y_1 = \mathcal{L}(1), \tag{32}$$

$$\mu - \sum_{i=2+(k-1)\Delta}^{1+k\Delta} y_k = \mathcal{L}(1 + k\Delta), \text{for } k = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{1}{2\delta} - 1, \tag{33}$$

$$y_k = 0, \forall k \geq (\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)\Delta + 2. \tag{34}$$

Consider the following dual variables:

$$\mu = \mathcal{L}(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2\delta}), \tag{35}$$

$$y_k = 0, \forall k \geq (\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)\Delta + 2, \tag{36}$$

$$y_k = \mathcal{L}(k + \Delta) - \mathcal{L}(k + \Delta - 1) + y(k + \Delta), \forall 2 \leq k \leq (\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)\Delta + 1, \tag{37}$$

$$y_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}} (\mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(i\Delta)) \geq 0, \tag{38}$$

$$y_0 = \mu - \mathcal{L}(1) - y_1 = \mathcal{L}(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2\delta}) - \mathcal{L}(1) - \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}} (\mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(i\Delta)) \geq 0. \tag{39}$$

It is easy to verify that these dual variables satisfy the constraints of the dual linear program, and the value of the objective function is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - 2\delta \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} y_k =& \mu - 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} (\mu - \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta)) && (40)\\ =& 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta). && (41) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by weak duality we have

$$V_{LB} \geq 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta). \tag{42}$$

Due to (27), we conclude

$$V_{LB} = 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta). \tag{43}$$

■

C. Uniform Noise Mechanism

Consider the noise with the *uniform* probability distribution:

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta}{\Delta} & \forall -\frac{\Delta}{2\delta} \leq k \leq \frac{\Delta}{2\delta} - 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

It is readily verified that this noise probability distribution satisfies the $(0, \delta)$ differential privacy constraint. Therefore, an upper bound for V^* is

Theorem 3.

$$V^* \leq V_{UB} \triangleq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}-1} \frac{\delta}{\Delta}\mathcal{L}(i) + \frac{\delta}{\Delta}\mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}). \tag{45}$$

D. Comparison of V_{LB} and V_{UB}

We first apply the lower bound (24) and upper bound (45) to ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions, i.e., $\mathcal{L}(i) = |i|$ and $\mathcal{L}(i) = i^2$, in which V^* corresponds to the minimum expected noise amplitude and minimum noise power, respectively.

Note that in the case $\mathcal{L}(i) = |i|$, the condition (23) in Theorem 2 is

$$\frac{\Delta}{2\delta} \geq \frac{1}{\delta} + 1. \tag{46}$$

When $\Delta \geq 3$, (23) holds.

Corollary 4. *For the cost function* $\mathcal{L}(i) = |i|$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{LB} &= \frac{\Delta}{4\delta} + 1 - \frac{\Delta}{2}, && (47)\\ V_{UB} &= \frac{\Delta}{4\delta}, && (48) \end{aligned}$$

and thus the additive gap

$$V_{UB} - V_{LB} = \frac{\Delta}{2} - 1 \tag{49}$$

is a constant independent of δ.

In the case $\mathcal{L}(i) = i^2$, the condition (23) in Theorem 2 is

$$\frac{\Delta}{2\delta^2}(\frac{\Delta}{2} - 1) \geq \frac{1}{\delta} + 1. \tag{50}$$

When $\Delta \geq 3$, (50) holds.

Corollary 5. *For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(i) = i^2$,*

$$V_{LB} = \frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2} - \frac{\Delta^2}{4\delta} + \Delta(\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1) + \frac{\Delta^2}{6} + 1, \tag{51}$$

$$V_{UB} = \frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2} + \frac{1}{6}, \tag{52}$$

and thus the multiplicative gap

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} = 1. \tag{53}$$

Proof: First we compute the lower bound V_{LB} via

$$\begin{aligned} V_{LB} &= 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \delta \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta) & (54)\\ &= 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} (1 + i\Delta)^2 & (55)\\ &= 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} (1 + 2i\Delta + i^2\Delta^2) & (56)\\ &= 2\delta(\frac{1}{2\delta} + 2\Delta \frac{\frac{1}{2\delta}(\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)}{2} + \Delta^2 \frac{(\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)\frac{1}{2\delta}(2\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)}{6}) & (57)\\ &= 1 + \Delta(\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1) + \frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2} + \frac{\Delta^2}{6} - \frac{\Delta^2}{4\delta} & (58)\\ &= \Theta(\frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2}). & (59) \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{UB} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}-1} \frac{\delta}{\Delta}\mathcal{L}(i) + \frac{\delta}{\Delta}\mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}) & (60)\\ &= 2\frac{\delta}{\Delta} \frac{(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta} - 1)\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}(\frac{\Delta}{\delta} - 1)}{6} + \frac{\delta}{\Delta}\frac{\Delta^2}{4\delta^2} & (61)\\ &= \frac{1}{6}(\frac{\Delta^2}{2\delta^2} + 1 - \frac{3\Delta}{2\delta}) + \frac{\Delta}{4\delta} & (62)\\ &= \frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2} + \frac{1}{6} & (63)\\ &= \Theta(\frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2}). & (64) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the multiplicative gap goes to one as $\delta \to 0$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} = 1. \tag{65}$$

■

Corollary 6. *Given a positive integer m, consider the cost function $\mathcal{L}(i) = |i|^m$. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} = 1. \tag{66}$$

Proof: By induction, it is easy to show that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i^m = \Theta(\frac{n^{m+1}}{m+1})$, and

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} i^m}{\frac{n^{m+1}}{m+1}} = 1. \tag{67}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} &= \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{2\frac{\delta}{\Delta} \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}-1} i^m + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \frac{\Delta^m}{(2\delta)^m}}{2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} (1 + i\Delta)^m} && (68) \\
&= \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{2\frac{\delta}{\Delta} \frac{\frac{\Delta^{m+1}}{(2\delta)^{m+1}}}{m+1}}{2\delta \Delta^m \frac{(\frac{1}{2\delta})^{m+1}}{m+1}} && (69) \\
&= 1. && (70)
\end{aligned}$$

■

For general cost functions, we have the following bound on the multiplicative gap between the lower bound and upper bound.

Corollary 7. *Given a cost function $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ satisfying*

$$\sup_{k \geq T} \frac{\mathcal{L}(k)}{\mathcal{L}(k - \Delta + 1)} \leq C, \tag{71}$$

for some integer $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and some positive number $C \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} \leq 1 + (1 + \frac{1}{2\Delta})C. \tag{72}$$

Proof: Using the fact that $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is a monotonically increasing function for $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{UB} - V_{LB} &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}-1} \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(i) + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}) - 2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta) && (73) \\
&\leq -2\delta \mathcal{L}(1) + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}) + 2\delta \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta} - 1) && (74) \\
&\leq (2 + \frac{1}{\Delta}) \delta \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}). && (75)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} &= 1 + \frac{V_{UB} - V_{LB}}{V_{LB}} && (76) \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{\Delta}) \delta \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta})}{2\delta \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{2\delta}-1} \mathcal{L}(1 + i\Delta)} && (77) \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{(2 + \frac{1}{\Delta}) \delta \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta})}{2\delta \mathcal{L}(1 + (\frac{1}{2\delta} - 1)\Delta)}, && (78)
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} \leq 1 + (1 + \frac{1}{2\Delta})C. \tag{79}$$

■

IV. (ϵ, δ)-DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY

Recall that since $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is a symmetric function, without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to symmetric noise probability distributions, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \mathcal{P}_{-k}, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{80}$$

The differential privacy constraint in (9) can be understood in some detail by choosing the subset $S = S_k := \{\ell : \ell \geq k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case we see that the noise probability distribution must satisfy the following constraints. For $k = 0$ and $d = \Delta$,

$$\mathcal{P}_{S_0} \leq e^{\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_{S_\Delta} + \delta. \tag{81}$$

By using the symmetry condition in (80) and the fact that $\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{P}_\ell = 1$, from (81) we get

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{1 + e^{\epsilon}}{2} + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_\ell \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2}. \tag{82}$$

For $k = 1$ and $d = \Delta$, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{S_1} \leq e^{\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_{S_{\Delta+1}} + \delta, \tag{83}$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\Delta} \mathcal{P}_\ell \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2}. \tag{84}$$

For general $k \geq 2$ and $d = \Delta$, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{S_k} \leq e^{\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_{S_{\Delta+k}} + \delta, \tag{85}$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} + (e^{\epsilon} - 1) \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}_\ell + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{\ell=k}^{k+\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_\ell \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2}. \tag{86}$$

A. Lower Bound

By restricting the set S in (9) to be $S_k := \{\ell : \ell \geq k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and restricting d to be Δ, we get the following relaxed linear program, the solution of which is a lower bound for V^*:

$$V_{LB} := \min \quad 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}(k) \mathcal{P}_k \tag{87}$$

$$\text{such that} \quad \mathcal{P}_k \geq 0 \quad \forall k \in N \tag{88}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_0}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_k \geq \frac{1}{2} \tag{89}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{1 + \epsilon^{\epsilon}}{2} + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_k \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} \tag{90}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^{\Delta} \mathcal{P}_k \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} \tag{91}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2} + (e^{\epsilon} - 1) \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{P}_k + e^{\epsilon} \sum_{k=i}^{i+\Delta-1} \mathcal{P}_k \leq \delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon} - 1}{2}, \forall i \geq 2. \tag{92}$$

Define

$$a \triangleq \frac{\delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon}-1}{2}}{e^{\epsilon}}, \tag{93}$$

$$b \triangleq e^{-\epsilon}. \tag{94}$$

To avoid integer rounding issues, assume that there exists an integer n such that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{95}$$

Theorem 8. *If*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} e^{-i\epsilon}(2\mathcal{L}(i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+(i-1)\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta)) \geq \mathcal{L}(1), \tag{96}$$

then we have

$$V^* \geq V_{LB} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon}-1}{2}}{e^{\epsilon}} e^{-k\epsilon}\mathcal{L}(1+k\Delta). \tag{97}$$

Proof: Consider the feasible primal variables $\{p_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_k = \begin{cases} ab^i & \text{for } k = 1+i\Delta, 0 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{98}$$

It is straightforward to verify that the above primal variables satisfy the constraints of the relaxed linear program, and the corresponding value of the objective function is

$$2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k \mathcal{L}(1+k\Delta). \tag{99}$$

We prove it is also the optimal value by constructing the optimal dual variables for the corresponding dual linear program.

Associating dual variables μ, y_0, y_1, y_i with the primal constraints in (89),(90),(91) and (92), respectively, we have the dual linear program:

$$V_{LB} := \min \quad \mu - (2\delta + e^{\epsilon} - 1)\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} y_k \tag{100}$$

$$\text{such that} \quad \mu \geq 0, y_k \geq 0 \quad \forall k \in N \tag{101}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\mu - \frac{1+e^{\epsilon}}{2}y_0 - \frac{e^{\epsilon}-1}{2}y_1 - \frac{e^{\epsilon}-1}{2}\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} y_k \leq 0 \tag{102}$$

$$\mu - e^{\epsilon}y_0 - e^{\epsilon}y_1 - (e^{\epsilon}-1)\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} y_k \leq \mathcal{L}(1) \tag{103}$$

$$\mu - e^{\epsilon} \sum_{l=\max(0,k-\Delta+1)}^{k} y_l - (e^{\epsilon}-1)\sum_{l=k+1}^{+\infty} y_l \leq \mathcal{L}(k), \forall k \geq 2. \tag{104}$$

If the primal variables defined in (98) are the optimal solution, the complementary slackness conditions require that the corresponding dual variables satisfy that

$$\mu = \mathcal{L}(1) + e^{\epsilon}(y_0 + y_1) + (e^{\epsilon} - 1)\sum_{l=2}^{+\infty} y_l \tag{105}$$

$$\mu = \mathcal{L}(1+\Delta) + e^{\epsilon}\sum_{l=2}^{1+\Delta} y_l + (e^{\epsilon} - 1)\sum_{l=2+\Delta}^{+\infty} y_l \tag{106}$$

$$\mu = \mathcal{L}(1+k\Delta) + e^{\epsilon}\sum_{l=2+(k-1)\Delta}^{1+k\Delta} y_l + (e^{\epsilon} - 1)\sum_{l=2+k\Delta}^{+\infty} y_l, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \tag{107}$$

$$y_l = 0, \forall l \geq 2 + (n-1)\Delta. \tag{108}$$

Consider the following dual variables defined via

$$\mu = \mathcal{L}(1 + (n-1)\Delta), \tag{109}$$

$$y_k = 0, \forall k \geq 2 + (n-2)\Delta, \tag{110}$$

$$y_k = b(y_{k+\Delta} + \mathcal{L}(k+\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(k+\Delta-1)), \forall 2 \leq k \leq 1 + (n-2)\Delta, \tag{111}$$

$$y_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i(\mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(i\Delta)), \tag{112}$$

$$y_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i(\mathcal{L}(i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+(i-1)\Delta)). \tag{113}$$

We verify that the above dual variables satisfy the inequality (102) in the following

$$(1+e^{\epsilon})y_0 + (e^{\epsilon}-1)y_1 + (e^{\epsilon}-1)\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} y_k - \mu \geq 0 \tag{114}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y_0 - y_1 + e^{\epsilon}(y_0 + y_1) + (e^{\epsilon}-1)\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} y_k - \mu \geq 0 \tag{115}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y_0 - y_1 + \mu - \mathcal{L}(1) - \mu \geq 0 \tag{116}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow y_0 - y_1 - \mathcal{L}(1) \geq 0 \tag{117}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i(2\mathcal{L}(i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+(i-1)\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta)) \geq \mathcal{L}(1). \tag{118}$$

It is easy to verify that the dual variables satisfy the constraints (101), (102), (103) and (104) in the dual linear program. Next we compute the corresponding value of the objective function

$$\mu - (2\delta + e^{\epsilon} - 1)\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} y_k \tag{119}$$

$$= \mu - (2\delta + e^{\epsilon} - 1)(y_0 + y_1 + \frac{\mu - \mathcal{L}(1) - e^{\epsilon}(y_0+y_1)}{e^{\epsilon}-1}) \tag{120}$$

$$= \mu - \frac{2\delta + e^{\epsilon} - 1}{e^{\epsilon}-1}(\mu - \mathcal{L}(1) - y_0 - y_1) \tag{121}$$

$$= \mathcal{L}(1+(n-1)\Delta) - \frac{2\delta + e^{\epsilon} - 1}{e^{\epsilon}-1}(\mathcal{L}(1+(n-1)\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b^i(\mathcal{L}(1+i\Delta) - \mathcal{L}(1+(i-1)\Delta))) \tag{122}$$

$$= 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k\mathcal{L}(1+k\Delta), \tag{123}$$

which is also the value of the objecitve function in the primal problem achieved by the primal variables defined in (98). Therefore, we conclude that

$$V_{LB} = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k \mathcal{L}(1 + k\Delta). \tag{124}$$

■

B. *Upper Bound: Uniform Noise Mechanism and Discrete Laplacian Mechanism*

Since $(0, \delta)$-differential privacy implies (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy, we can use the uniform noise mechanism with noise probability distribution defined in (44) to preserve (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy, and the corresponding upper bound is

Theorem 9. *For (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy, we have*

$$V^* \le V_{UB}^{\textit{uniform}} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}-1} \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(i) + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \mathcal{L}(\frac{\Delta}{2\delta}). \tag{125}$$

On the other hand, if we simply ignore the parameter δ (i.e., set $\delta = 0$), we can use a discrete variant of Laplacian distribution to satisfy the $(\epsilon, 0)$-differential privacy, which implies (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy.

More precisely, define $\lambda \triangleq e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\Delta}}$.

Theorem 10. *The probability distribution $\mathcal{P}$ with*

$$p_k \triangleq \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \lambda^{|} k|, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{126}$$

satisfies the (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy constraint, and the corresonding cost is

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} p_k \mathcal{L}(k) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \lambda^k \mathcal{L}(k). \tag{127}$$

Corollary 11.

$$V^* \le V_{UB}^{\textit{Lap}} \triangleq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} \lambda^k \mathcal{L}(k) \tag{128}$$

C. *Comparison of Lower Bound and Upper Bound*

In this section, we compare the lower bound (97) and the upper bounds V_{UB}^{uniform} and V_{UB}^{Lap} for (ϵ, δ)-differential privacy for ℓ^1 and ℓ^2 cost functions, i.e., $\mathcal{L}(i) = |i|$ and $\mathcal{L}(i) = i^2$, in which V^* corresponds to the minimum expected noise amplitude and minimum noise power, respectively. We show that the multiplicative gap between the lower bound and upper bound is bounded by a constant as $(\epsilon, \delta) \to (0, 0)$.

1) $\epsilon \le \delta$ regime: We first compare the gap between the lower bound V_{LB} and the upper bound V_{UB}^{uniform} in the regime $\epsilon \le \delta$ as $\delta \to 0$.

Corollary 12. *For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = |k|$, in the regime $\epsilon \le \delta$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\textit{uniform}}}{V_{LB}} \le \frac{1}{4(1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2})}. \tag{129}$$

Proof: For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = |k|$,

$$V_{LB} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k \mathcal{L}(1 + k\Delta) \tag{130}$$

$$= 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k (1 + k\Delta) \tag{131}$$

$$= 1 + 2a\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b^k k \tag{132}$$

$$= 1 + 2a\Delta(\frac{b - b^n}{(1-b)^2} - \frac{(n-1)b^n}{1-b}). \tag{133}$$

Given $\delta > 0$, V_{LB} is a decreasing function of ϵ. Therefore, to lower bound $\frac{V_{UB}^{\text{uniform}}}{V_{LB}}$ in the regime $\epsilon \leq \delta$, we only need to consider the case $\epsilon = \delta$. Thus, in the following we set $\epsilon = \delta$.

Since $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$a\frac{1-b^n}{1-b} = \frac{1}{2} \tag{134}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow b^n = 1 - \frac{1-b}{2a}. \tag{135}$$

As $\delta \to 0$, $\frac{1-b}{2a} = \frac{1-e^{-\epsilon}}{2\frac{\delta + \frac{e^{\epsilon}-1}{2}}{e^{\epsilon}}} \to \frac{1}{3}$, and thus

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} b^n = 1 - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3}, \tag{136}$$

$$n = \Theta(\frac{\log(\frac{3}{2})}{\epsilon}). \tag{137}$$

Note that $a = \Theta(\frac{3}{2}\delta)$ as $\delta \to 0$.

Therefore, as $\delta \to 0$,

$$V_{LB} \approx 2\Delta a(\frac{1 - \frac{2}{3}}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{\frac{\log(\frac{3}{2})}{\epsilon}\frac{2}{3}}{\epsilon}) \tag{138}$$

$$\approx 2\Delta\frac{3}{2}\delta(\frac{1}{3\delta^2} - \frac{\frac{2}{3}\log(\frac{3}{2})}{\delta^2}) \tag{139}$$

$$= \frac{\Delta}{\delta}(1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2}) \tag{140}$$

$$\approx 0.19\frac{\Delta}{\delta}. \tag{141}$$

Recall $V_{UB}^{\text{uniform}} = \frac{1}{4\delta}$.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\epsilon=\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} = \frac{1}{4(1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2})} \approx 1.32, \tag{142}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\epsilon\leq\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}}{V_{LB}} \leq \frac{1}{4(1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2})} \approx 1.32, \tag{143}$$

■

Corollary 13. *For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = k^2$, in the regime $\epsilon \leq \delta$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\textit{uniform}}}{V_{LB}} \leq \frac{1}{12(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx \frac{5}{3}. \tag{144}$$

Proof: Using the same argument in the proof of Corollary 14, we can set $\epsilon = \delta$.
For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = k^2$,

$$V_{LB} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k \mathcal{L}(1 + k\Delta) \tag{145}$$

$$= 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k (1 + k\Delta)^2 \tag{146}$$

$$= 1 + 4a\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b^k k + 2a\Delta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b^k k^2 \tag{147}$$

$$\approx 2a\Delta^2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b^k k^2 \tag{148}$$

$$= 2\Delta^2 \frac{\delta + \frac{e^\epsilon - 1}{2}}{e^\epsilon} \frac{-b + 2(\frac{b(1-b^{n-1})}{(1-b)^2} - \frac{(n-1)b^n}{1-b}) - \frac{b^2(1-b^{n-2})}{1-b} - (n-1)^2 b^n}{1-b} \tag{149}$$

$$\approx 2\Delta^2 \frac{3}{2}\epsilon \frac{2(\frac{1-\frac{2}{3}}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{\frac{2}{3}\log(\frac{3}{2})}{\epsilon^2}) - \frac{1}{3\epsilon} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2}{\epsilon^2}}{\epsilon} \tag{150}$$

$$\approx \frac{3\Delta^2}{\epsilon^2}(\frac{2}{3} - \frac{4}{3}\log(\frac{3}{2}) - \frac{2}{3}(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2) \tag{151}$$

$$= \frac{\Delta^2}{\epsilon^2}(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2) \tag{152}$$

$$\approx \frac{\Delta^2}{20\epsilon^2} \tag{153}$$

$$= \frac{\Delta^2}{20\delta^2} \tag{154}$$

Recall $V_{UB}^{\text{uniform}} = \frac{\Delta^2}{12\delta^2}$.
Therefore,

$$\lim_{\epsilon = \delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{uniform}}}{V_{LB}} = \frac{1}{12(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx \frac{5}{3}, \tag{155}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\epsilon \le \delta \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{uniform}}}{V_{LB}} \le \frac{1}{12(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx \frac{5}{3}. \tag{156}$$

■

2) $\delta \le \epsilon$ regime: We then compare the gap between the lower bound V_{LB} and the upper bound V_{UB}^{Lap} in the regime $\delta \le \epsilon$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Corollary 14. *For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = |k|$, in the regime $\delta \le \epsilon$, we have*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{Lap}}{V_{LB}} \le \frac{1}{1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2}} \approx 5.29. \tag{157}$$

Proof:

For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = |k|$,

$$V_{LB} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k \mathcal{L}(1 + k\Delta) \tag{158}$$

$$= 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} ab^k (1 + k\Delta) \tag{159}$$

$$= 1 + 2a\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b^k k \tag{160}$$

$$= 1 + 2a\Delta\left(\frac{b - b^n}{(1-b)^2} - \frac{(n-1)b^n}{1-b}\right). \tag{161}$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, V_{LB} is a decreasing function of δ. Therefore, to lower bound $\frac{V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}}}{V_{LB}}$ in the regime $\delta \leq \epsilon$, we only need to consider the case $\delta = \epsilon$. Thus, in the following we set $\delta = \epsilon$.

Following the same calculations in the proof of Corollary 14, we have

$$V_{LB} \approx \frac{\Delta}{\delta}(1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2}) \tag{162}$$

$$\approx 0.19\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \tag{163}$$

$$= 0.19\frac{\Delta}{\epsilon}. \tag{164}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}} = 2\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\lambda^k k \tag{165}$$

$$= \frac{2e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{\Delta}}}{1 - e^{-2\frac{\epsilon}{\Delta}}} \tag{166}$$

$$\approx \frac{\Delta}{\epsilon}, \tag{167}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\epsilon=\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}}}{V_{LB}} = \frac{1}{1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2}} \approx 5.29, \tag{168}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\epsilon\leq\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}}}{V_{LB}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\log\frac{3}{2}} \approx 5.29. \tag{169}$$

■

Corollary 15. *For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = k^2$, in the regime $\epsilon \leq \delta$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\textit{Lap}}}{V_{LB}} \leq \frac{2}{(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx 40. \tag{170}$$

Proof: Using the same argument in the proof of Corollary 14, we can set $\epsilon = \delta$.

For the cost function $\mathcal{L}(k) = k^2$, following the same calculations in the proof of Corollary 13, we have

$$V_{LB} \approx \frac{\Delta^2}{\epsilon^2}(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2) \tag{171}$$

$$\approx \frac{\Delta^2}{20\epsilon^2} \tag{172}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}} = 2\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\lambda^k k^2 \tag{173}$$

$$= \frac{2\lambda}{(1-\lambda)^2} \tag{174}$$

$$\approx 2\frac{\Delta^2}{\epsilon^2}, \tag{175}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\epsilon=\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}}}{V_{LB}} = \frac{2}{(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx 40, \tag{176}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\epsilon\leq\delta\to 0} \frac{V_{UB}^{\text{Lap}}}{V_{LB}} \leq \frac{2}{(2 - 4\log(\frac{3}{2}) - 2(\log(\frac{3}{2}))^2)} \approx 40. \tag{177}$$

■

REFERENCES

[1] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Theory of Cryptography*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, S. Halevi and T. Rabin, Eds. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2006, vol. 3876, pp. 265–284.

[2] C. Dwork, "Differential Privacy: A Survey of Results," in *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, vol. 4978, 2008, pp. 1–19.

[3] Q. Geng and P. Viswanath, "The optimal mechanism in differential privacy," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1212.1186, 2013.

[4] K. Nissim, S. Raskhodnikova, and A. Smith, "Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis," in *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ser. STOC '07. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2007, pp. 75–84. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1250790.1250803

[5] F. McSherry and K. Talwar, "Mechanism design via differential privacy," in *Proceedings of the 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, ser. FOCS '07. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2007, pp. 94–103. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2007.41

[6] C. Dwork, K. Kenthapadi, F. McSherry, I. Mironov, and M. Naor, "Our data, ourselves: privacy via distributed noise generation," in *Proceedings of the 24th annual international conference on The Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, ser. EUROCRYPT'06. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2006, pp. 486–503. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/11761679_29

[7] A. Ghosh, T. Roughgarden, and M. Sundararajan, "Universally utility-maximizing privacy mechanisms," in *Proceedings of the 41st annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ser. STOC '09. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 351–360. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1536414.1536464

[8] H. Brenner and K. Nissim, "Impossibility of differentially private universally optimal mechanisms," in *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2010 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on*, oct. 2010, pp. 71 –80.

[9] M. Gupte and M. Sundararajan, "Universally optimal privacy mechanisms for minimax agents," in *Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, 2010, pp. 135–146.

[10] M. Hardt and K. Talwar, "On the geometry of differential privacy," in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ser. STOC '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 705–714. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1806689.1806786

[11] A. Nikolov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang, "The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1212.0297, 2012.